

Syracuse University

SURFACE

Syracuse University Honors Program Capstone
Projects

Syracuse University Honors Program Capstone
Projects

Spring 5-1-2010

A Spectrum of Philosophies: The Rhetorical Framing of Avant-Garde Art Manifestos of the Early Twentieth Century

Alison Kara Falotico

Follow this and additional works at: https://surface.syr.edu/honors_capstone



Part of the [Critical and Cultural Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Falotico, Alison Kara, "A Spectrum of Philosophies: The Rhetorical Framing of Avant-Garde Art Manifestos of the Early Twentieth Century" (2010). *Syracuse University Honors Program Capstone Projects*. 336.
https://surface.syr.edu/honors_capstone/336

This Honors Capstone Project is brought to you for free and open access by the Syracuse University Honors Program Capstone Projects at SURFACE. It has been accepted for inclusion in Syracuse University Honors Program Capstone Projects by an authorized administrator of SURFACE. For more information, please contact surface@syr.edu.

Introduction

The manifesto form has often been associated with political movements. Many different revolutionary political movements have devised manifestos to launch a movement and generate public support. Scholars¹ from diverse fields cite Karl Marx and Friedrich Engel's *Communist Manifesto* of 1848 as both the first example of a manifesto and one of the most copied in terms of its genre² and structure. Because the 1848 *Communist Manifesto* is associated with being an extreme left-wing document³, other manifestos are then subsequently assumed to be of an extreme left-wing philosophy as well. Social movements have also utilized the manifesto as an effective document to aid their movements. For example the Feminist manifestos of the late 1960s and the 1969 "Black Manifesto," given by James Forman, are examples of well-known and impactful social movement manifestos. The Seneca Falls Woman's Rights Convention in 1848 offered a less radical approach to the manifesto genre with the suffragists' "Declaration of Sentiments." Conversely, the later Feminist manifestos of the 1960s, such as the "S.C.U.M. Manifesto" (The Society for Cutting Up Men), along with Forman's "Black Manifesto," clearly exemplify a more radical genre.⁴

Avant-garde art movements have also adopted the manifesto document as a tactic for mobilizing support; however, their manifestos display a range and spectrum of philosophies. The idea that avant-garde art manifestos exemplify both left-wing and right-wing philosophies has not been addressed in rhetorical studies scholarship and therefore makes the topic worthy of study. Leaders of these movements specifically label the documents manifestos and therefore have often

been understood as political tracts. Whereas there may be some similarities in general format, the political manifestos tend to adopt left-wing political philosophies and argument typologies while the art manifestos tend to adopt either left-wing or right-wing political philosophies and argument typologies.⁵ Because the literature associates the manifesto document as being almost exclusively the result of extreme left-wing political philosophies and argument typologies all subsequent manifestos are likewise associated with this idea. This essay will address the idea that avant-garde art movements of the early twentieth century produced manifestos along a spectrum of political philosophies and that these manifestos must not be grouped under a singular extreme left-wing philosophy but instead as works that demonstrate a ranging spectrum of both left-wing and right-wing political philosophies and argument typologies.

Marx and Engel's *Communist Manifesto* of 1848 functions as the primary antecedent for diverse scholars examining subsequent manifestos. Examining these scholars' arguments will help to better understand why readers associate extreme left-wing philosophies and arguments with avant-garde art manifestos when they can, in fact, be of either left-wing or right-wing philosophies. Part of this problem arises because the literature offers a narrow filter for the manifesto genre that labels it as a document of an extreme left-wing philosophy that is often on a political tract. In scholar Janet Lyon's 1999 book, *Manifestoes: Provocations of the Modern*, she explains the manifesto genre and structure and argues that Marx and Engel's *Communist Manifesto* of 1848 is the original model. When Lyon argues this point, she does not even introduce the *Communist Manifesto*, as

she does with other manifestos she cites.⁶ Lyon also cites the *Communist Manifesto* more than any other manifestos in her introductory chapter, yet she assumes the widespread knowledge of the document and feels no need to introduce it.⁷ This assumption, as well as the repetitive citing, supports the idea that later manifestos are narrowly evaluated in relation to the form and intent of the *Communist Manifesto*. In *Manifesto: A Century of Isms*, historian Mary Ann Caws grounds the entire project on the document stating, “the *Communist Manifesto* of Friedrich Engels and Karl Marx in 1848 is the original model, of immense influence and historical importance for later aesthetic proclamations and political statements.”⁸ By placing this statement at the beginning of her book, Caws established the *Communist Manifesto* as *the* point of comparison when reading subsequent manifestos. These two books, especially Janet Lyon’s, focus much attention and discussion on the manifesto form and establish the 1848 *Communist Manifesto* as the most relevant antecedent. This essay will argue that the avant-garde art manifestos of the early twentieth century establish an alternative framing for the general discussion of the manifesto as a document; demonstrating instead how manifestos lie upon a spectrum of philosophies and arguments ranging from left-wing to right-wing movements.

One of the important qualities of a revolutionary manifesto, such as the *Communist Manifesto*, is the implication of violence. Janet Lyon uses the 1848 *Communist Manifesto* to underscore this point by highlighting the amount of “if-then future clause demands” in the document.⁹ These “if-then clauses” evoke the feeling of an ultimatum. For example, within the second section of the *Communist*

Manifesto, the ultimate demands are laid out in a list format. As a conclusion

Marx and Engels write:

If the proletariat during its contest with the bourgeoisie is compelled, by the force of circumstances, to organize itself as a class, if by means of a revolution it makes itself the ruling class and, as such, sweeps away by force the old conditions of production, then it will, along with these conditions, have swept away the conditions for the existence of class antagonism and of classes generally, and will thereby have abolished its own supremacy as a class.¹⁰

Although this is technically not an ultimatum, it does explain a way that the “enemy,” the bourgeoisie class, can change itself to fit within the new contexts of the Communists’ wishes. These “if-then clauses” allow for a way to organize the demands laid out by a political or social movement.

Another aspect of the manifesto form is to invoke action and change. The type of action usually called for by a revolutionary political manifesto is of a physical nature, just as the violent rhetoric implies. Lyon remarks, “the insistence of manifesto rhetoric signifies an impatience with deliberative modes: ‘the time for argument is past,’ declares the typical manifesto; ‘no more talk: now it is time for action’.”¹¹ The aim of these political manifestos was to ultimately change a social system and they carried out these aims in a radical manner with their arguments and actions. For example, in the frequently cited *Communist Manifesto*, the closing statements definitively say:

The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions. Let the ruling classes tremble at a Communistic revolution. The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win. WORKING MEN OF ALL COUNTRIES UNITE!¹²

Readers can clearly see by the use of such phrases as “forcible overthrow,” that radical actions seem to be the Communists’ only chance at social change. These closing statements clearly correspond with Janet Lyon’s statement that manifestos call for an end to discussion in order to invoke a new method of action.

Although the presumption of radicalism attached to the manifesto form has shaped the analyses of the early twentieth century avant-garde manifestos in significant ways, I will argue that these manifestos lie upon a spectrum of typologies and arguments that range from the left-wing to the right-wing. The early political manifestos follow the arguments of revolutionary and radical social movements. Rossiter’s Political Spectrum (Figure 1) of political philosophies and argument typologies will be discussed later on in this essay to understand the idea that manifestos range and are explicated along this spectrum of political philosophies and argument typologies. In general, extreme left-wing political manifestos were looking to gather followers and hopefully upturn their country’s social system and install a new system and set of values. These avant-garde art manifestos of the early twentieth century were also interested in gathering followers; however, their aims and varied intentions fall along Rossiter’s Political Spectrum and are not just limited to the left-wing philosophies and arguments. As this essay will display, some manifestos were in fact radical with revolutionary tendencies while others were less radical and restorative in their demands. This essay will demonstrate the point that manifestos must be examined knowing that

they lie upon a spectrum and cannot all be generally classified as results of left-wing political philosophies and argument typologies.

Part I: Conceptual Overview

Movement Arguments

Social movements can be studied and analyzed in relation to a clear conceptual spectrum. Communications scholar Clinton Rossiter devised a political spectrum to help classify and analyze social movements (Figure 1). This social spectrum includes seven different political philosophies as well as seven different argument typologies that all interact with each other in different ways along a circular diagram. The seven political philosophies include revolutionary radicalism, radicalism, liberalism, conservatism, standpattism, reaction, and revolutionary reaction; and the seven argument typologies include insurgent, innovational, progressive, retentive, reversionary, restorative, and revolutionary. The left-wing philosophies include revolutionary radicalism and radicalism and use the revolutionary, insurgent, and innovational arguments. The right-wing philosophies include revolutionary reaction and reaction and use the revolutionary, restorative, and reversionary arguments. It is evident that most manifestos, whether political, social, or artistic, do not fall within the moderate or centrist philosophies of liberalism, conservatism, and standpattism and do not use the progressive or retentive arguments. Understanding the seven different political philosophies and the seven corresponding argument typologies will help to categorize and classify the specific art movements and their manifestos. The 1909 Futurist Manifesto will be classified as a product of the left-wing revolutionary radicalism philosophy that uses revolutionary arguments, whereas the 1919 Bauhaus Manifesto will be classified as a product of the right-wing reaction

philosophy that uses restorative arguments. Revolutionary radicalism seeks to change social systems to a more favorable and “benign way of life,” because it feels that the social system is “diseased and oppressive, [and the] traditional values dissembling and dishonest.”¹³ Revolutionary radicalism reveals what is wrong with the societal institutions, but simply proposes a way to change the social system. Radicalism is also unhappy with current social institutions; however, it is more patient for change than revolutionary radicalism. Radicalism still proposes change and devises plans, but it is aware of the time it may take to have full reform.¹⁴

Liberalism and conservatism are the more common political terms used in colloquial speech, and their philosophies tend to be more general and easy to classify. Standpattism is also close to these two common philosophies on the Rossiter’s political spectrum; however, its ideas seem to be too concrete to associate well with any other philosophy on the spectrum. Liberalism, for example, is usually content with the current order and way of life and feels that life can change and be improved, if need be, “without betraying its ideals or wrecking its institutions.”¹⁵ Conservatism is also generally content with the current social system and realizes that change is inevitable; however, conservatism is suspicious of change. It prefers “stability over change, continuity over experiment, [and] the past over the future.”¹⁶ Standpattism “prefers today over either the past or the future” and it highly opposes changes to any social system. Standpattism is not usually seen in many political realms, most likely, because of its strict beliefs and strict aversion to change or reflection.¹⁷

The political philosophies related to reactionary measures comprise the last two sections of the spectrum. The reaction philosophy, which can specifically classify the 1919 Bauhaus Manifesto, looks back thoughtfully on the past and wishes to try and revert back to older ways. “It is amenable to changing the present state of society... [but] limits the means it will employ to effect that change.”¹⁸ Finally, revolutionary reaction is usually seen as the most drastic philosophy of the political spectrum. This philosophy “is willing and anxious to use subversion and violence to overthrow established values and institutions.”¹⁹ It also looks back longingly at the past and labels a part of the past as “The Golden Age.” They are willing to use any means necessary to achieve their goals.

Between these seven political philosophies are seven different types of arguments. These arguments fall between two philosophies, which often utilize these types of argument in their aims. Between the revolutionary radical and the radical sections comes the insurgent argument. The insurgent argument is mainly confrontational. It argues passionately for change; however it is most often anti-violent in its demands.²⁰ The innovative argument, which falls between the radical and liberal sections of the spectrum, is also passionate for change in the social system, often in an experimental way; however, it never uses violent action to achieve its means. In essence, it is physically safer than the insurgent arguments.²¹

The progressive argument, which falls between the liberal and conservative sections of the spectrum, is the least confrontational in its demands for change. This argument uses the present social and political systems to advocate for moderate change.²² The retentive argument falls between the

conservative and standpattism points on the spectrum. This argument aims to maintain as much of the status quo as possible. It “concerns cautious [and] minimal change.”²³ The retentive argument tries to preserve certain aspects of the social system and tries to make those proposing the more radical arguments out to be the completely irrational enemies.

The reversive argument sits between the standpattism and reaction sections of the spectrum. This argument clearly attempts to revert back to previous political or societal systems. It argues that to move forward is dangerous and provides a means to return back to older ways.²⁴ The restorative argument, between the reaction and revolutionary reaction points of the spectrum, also focuses on a return to previous institutions and processes. It tries to answer the questions of why and when “a society went astray and how restoration can be accomplished.”²⁵ The Bauhaus Manifesto uses the restorative argument in its form and language. Between the revolutionary reaction and revolutionary radicalism points on the spectrum, therefore, lies the most drastic argument, the revolutionary argument. This argument “urges total overthrow of the existing order” and is the most confrontational by means of violence and action.²⁶ The Futurist Manifesto uses the revolutionary argument in its dramatic language and form. In short, this revolutionary argument “recommends violent actions against the established order.”²⁷ These political philosophies and related argument typologies allow a social movement to be classified and analyzed along a political spectrum from its inception and throughout its growth.

It is also important to recognize the different points of growth within a social movement and to note that a manifesto is typically written at the genesis stage of a social movement. During the genesis or inception phase of a social movement, only a few individuals are usually interested or passionate about the movement. The genesis phase of a social movement focuses on the issue at hand, usually against inequality, corruption or exploitation within a social system. The problem is expressed through rhetorical demands rather than through physical demands. Most of the general public is either not aware or does not care about a social movement within its genesis phase and the few followers must work during this phase to gather support and more followers. During the genesis phase, therefore, the writing of a manifesto is an often popular and beneficial strategy to gather support and followers.²⁸

Rhetorical Form

In the classical approach to persuasion, within rhetorical criticism, the two important elements are substance and form.

The substance of a message is illustrated by the actual arguments or persuasive appeals, the facts or content contained within a message. Conversely, the *form* of a message is the pattern of arrangement by which the content of a message is displayed to an audience.²⁹

The classical approach to rhetorical criticism divides and distinguishes between substance and form. This essay will use this classical framework in the conceptual

section; however, my analysis will adopt the contemporary approach that fuses both substance and form together.

As discussed earlier, social movements can be classified under different political philosophies that use corresponding argument typologies, according to Rossiter's Political Spectrum (Figure 1), to express themselves. These social movements are clearly motivated by language, whether it is verbal, non-verbal, written or performed. In this essay, however, the verbal and written forms will be focused on in lieu of specifically studying the manifesto genre. "Movements are essentially rhetorical transactions of a *special type*, distinguishable by the peculiar reciprocal rhetorical acts set off between the movement on the one hand and the established system or controlling agency on the other."³⁰ This "one against another" structure explains why scholar Robert Cathcart argues that social movements most often use the confrontation form in their language acts. Manifestos are also usually associated with the confrontational form, but as this essay will display, some manifestos will use the opposite managerial form in their documents. Confrontation is explained as a dramatic, "symbolic display" that is used by groups when they are in agony or great need, which makes it a perfect rhetorical vehicle for the language of passionate social movements.³¹ Confrontation is seen as "ritual enactment" that is used when accepted communication with oppressors no longer works. Confrontation is, therefore, the central rhetorical form of a social movement.³²

It has been generally accepted, primarily because of the works of well known communications scholar Kenneth Burke, that most rhetorical pieces come

in the *managerial* form. The *managerial* form believes in the existing system and “does not question underlying epistemology and group ethic.”³³ Cathcart points out, however, that it makes more sense to classify the rhetorical pieces of social movements into both the *managerial* form as well as the *confrontational* form. A “reform” social movement can actually be classified under the *managerial* form title because these movements would rather simply adjust the current system, rather than throw it away completely.³⁴ A social movement that is associated with left-wing radical philosophies, as the Futurist Manifesto, can clearly be classified under the *confrontational* form; conversely a document like the Bauhaus Manifesto that utilizes restorative arguments can be classified under the *managerial* form. In the *confrontational* types of social movements, there are two opposing agents; “one standing for the erroneous or evil system and the other upholding the new or perfect order.”³⁵ This structure is, again, the classic “one against another” scenario that thrives within a confrontational attitude and, unfortunately, “no movement for radical change can be taken seriously without acts of confrontation.”³⁶

Precedence

Manifesto Genre

The discussion of philosophical typologies and argument typologies will be important to the classification of social movement documents and avant-garde art manifestos. It is also important, however, to understand the classifications of

documents like the 1848 *Communist Manifesto*, considered to be the primary precedent for subsequent manifestos. While this essay will show that manifestos represent a spectrum of typologies and arguments, it is inevitable that rhetorical devices will overlap and be seen at work in all types of manifestos, which aids to label a piece as a *manifesto*.

Because Marx and Engel's *Communist Manifesto* of 1848 is considered to be a main precedent for avant-garde artistic manifestos, it is important to understand the contextual background and aims of the document. In February 1848, Karl Marx completed the *Communist Manifesto* and immediately sent the document to London to be printed, where it was published "as the official program of the Communist League" by mid-month.³⁷ Although the manifesto was not extremely popular after its first publication, it has now been translated in to most every other major language and is considered to be an extremely important document by political and communications scholars.³⁸ One of the benefits of Marx and Engel's manifesto was that it organized socialists' theories in to a concise and coherent written document.³⁹ The ability to synthesize a group's ideas and demands is a vital part of the manifesto form which will be seen in all subsequent effective manifestos.

The *Communist Manifesto* is divided into four sections, each having their own purpose and rhetorical form. The first section lays out the problem as hand. In the case of this manifesto, it is the issue of class struggles, especially between the bourgeoisie and proletariat classes.⁴⁰ The second section describes the merits of the rhetor. For this manifesto, it "explains the role of the communists as the

most advanced and resolute section of the working class.”⁴¹ The third section explains why this group, the communists, is better and more effective than other schools of socialist thought. This section emphasizes the goal of the social change. The fourth, and final, section places the communists within the historical context of other democratically revolutionary groups.⁴² This organization structure will set a general standard for subsequent manifestos. In order to gather followers, the clear explanation of the group’s history, goals, and aims is necessary. In general, this manifesto and political movement can be classified as a left-wing philosophy and of a *confrontational* form that uses revolutionary arguments wishing to completely overthrow the present social system. Because the *Communist Manifesto* is considered a main precedent, it can be easy to see why all subsequent manifestos would also be classified under this extreme left-wing framing. Yet as discussed, this essay will demonstrate the actual spectrum and range of manifesto documents is not generally addressed in scholarship.

Subsequent Scholarship Framing

Most scholars label the manifesto as a genre of collective speech rich in plural nouns such as “we” and “us.” Historian Mary Ann Caws argues that the manifesto provides “some ‘we,’ explicit or implicit, against some other ‘they’.”⁴³ Scholar Janet Lyon also highlights this point and states that the manifesto’s signature pronoun is “we” which supports the public and collective aspects of the piece.⁴⁴ Just as in social movements, art movements are also focused around a collective body advocating for change, and their manifestos become the voice of this collective body. As a voice for these collective bodies, the manifesto declares

the group's grievances and requires this plural voice to be effective. This plural voice is seen in both political manifestos arguing for social change and art manifestos arguing for creative change, even if their intentions are different.

Scholars have also noted that the manifesto is a piece of writing in the present tense, but one that is aware of its future place in history and therefore speaks in a historicizing manner. The manifesto form offers a present "call to action" document that can secure a place in history. As Lyon describes it, "a manifesto is understood as the testimony as a historical present tense spoken in the impassioned voice of its participants."⁴⁵ While the "present tense suits the manifesto,"⁴⁶ and is necessary to make it an effective written "call to action," the fact that it simultaneously secures a prominent place in history makes the manifesto genre powerful and important. Because the manifesto is generally an urgent call to action, the present tense verbs in the document are paired with positive arguments while the past tense statements are paired with what is wrong and needs to be changed. This method of arranging the arguments with specific tense is even explicitly laid out in the *Communist Manifesto* when, in the second section, where the bourgeoisie is labeled as the problem and the merit of the Communist rhetor is established, it states, "in bourgeois society, therefore, the past dominates the present; in Communist society, the present dominates the past."⁴⁷ The Futurist Manifesto will further extract this idea and move beyond even the present tense to the future tense. Because manifestos are declaring desires, goals, and ultimately calling followers to action, the present tense is not only suitable, but also necessary.

Scholars who have examined manifestos note the strategic nature of their organizational structure, such as the arrangement of the *Communist Manifesto* in to four clear sections. In particular, Janet Lyon identifies three conventions that are used to organize and structure a manifesto. She says that the manifesto begins by explaining the history of the oppression, leading up to the present time, in order to explain the crisis at hand, which must be changed. She then identifies that the demands of the oppressed group are explained, often in a numbered or bulleted format.⁴⁸ Lyon's third convention does not explain the structure of a manifesto, but rather, highlights the style of diction used in the manifesto, which is often of a declarative manner. Lyon's three conventions echo the format of the original *Communist Manifesto*, which is divided into four sections, by explaining that a manifesto moves from providing the history of a group's oppression, to the current demands and needs of a group, and finally, the explanation of a group's actions to be carried out and completed.⁴⁹ These three conventions, as labeled by Janet Lyon, can usually be identified in some fashion in a manifesto document.

A final common element of the manifesto genre is the style of diction used. As stated earlier, the tense of these manifestos is almost always in the present when expressing demands for change; however, the type of language used is also important to note. Caws argues, and most others agree, that "the manifesto is by nature a loud genre, unlike the essay...it calls for capital letters, loudness, [and] demands attention."⁵⁰ As Lyon stated in her third convention, the declarative style of rhetoric is almost always expressed through particular diction used.⁵¹ The common practice of using the declarative style of diction reference

back to the fact that most early manifestos were actually meant to be read aloud much like a performance,⁵² therefore, even in print form, the diction is one of theatrical means.⁵³ Some scholars even go so far as to highlight the sometimes violent and aggressive diction of these manifestos in their goal to incite people to action.⁵⁴ I would argue, that much of the success of the manifesto form comes from this declarative and motivating style of diction in order to capture the attention of its readers, and hopefully, future followers.

Preview

This essay will examine two avant-garde art movement manifestos written during the early twentieth century in order to explain the need for scholarship to put forward the idea that manifestos offer a spectrum of ideologies and arguments in their language. This essay will look at Filippo Tommaso Marinetti's 1909 "Futurist Manifesto" and Walter Gropius' 1919 manifesto entitled "The Program of the Staatliche Bauhaus in Weimar." While there is an abundance of art movement manifestos⁵⁵ written around the beginning of the twentieth century and between the two world wars, I have chosen these two because they exemplify the wide spectrum of manifesto language. The 1909 "The Founding and Manifesto of Futurism" uses a left-wing philosophy and argument typology whereas the Bauhaus Manifesto uses a right-wing philosophy and argument typology. These two manifestos, therefore, exemplify both ends of Rossiter's Political Spectrum (Figure 1) and offer a complete framing for the further study of subsequent avant-

garde artistic manifestos, which will fall between these two extremes. These two manifestos and corresponding art movements are also significant within the world of art and social history and are therefore appropriate to analyze for their documents' language.

Part II: Broad Contextual Overview

In order to illuminate the idea that manifestos and their language offer a spectrum of ideologies and arguments, it is important to understand the shared historical context surrounding the creation of these avant-garde art movements during the early twentieth century in Europe. The unique context and constraints that shaped the Futurist and Bauhaus manifestos will ground the textual analysis that follows. Three issues most shaped the European avant-garde prior to World War I: political turmoil and unrest surrounding the war; a spirit of collaboration and internationalism and, the increasing role of machines, industry, and mass production in everyday life.

The new century witnessed the birth of a number of art movements which in turn engendered the spread of the manifesto form. In the years leading up to World War I a plethora of art movements were formed throughout Europe.⁵⁶ Many artists of these specific art movements created works that were revolutionary and rejected social conditions even before World War I, but underneath were also longing for purity and a renewed sense of social order in their themes.⁵⁷ Some governments of Europe, however, also sought to contain the more radical movements. Many governments, especially the totalitarian regimes of Italy, Spain, and Germany, were not fond of these abstract and experimental art movements because their political associations were not along formal and accepted lines.⁵⁸ The people producing these styles of art were considered to be too radical and unwieldy to control, and therefore these governments rejected them. The British artist, Ben Nicholson, even commented that he felt “that the

liberation of form and colour achieved by abstract art paralleled, or was linked to, other forms of freedom.”⁵⁹ Whereas not all governments in Europe were totalitarian regimes, most governments disliked the followers and artists of these avant-garde movements. It was not that the governments specifically disliked the abstract style of art, but that they feared what these artists could or might do in terms of rejecting governmental authority.⁶⁰ These governments’ aversion to these avant-garde artists and their movements often resulted in the rejection of art to be shown in museums and the eventual closing of art schools and institutions. For example, the German Bauhaus school of design was closed because of their supposed connection with communism. One art movement of this time period, the Die Brücke movement, tried to express its feelings on human nature in their art works. Artists of this movement felt that the negative simplicity of the human form lay in the fact that humans are inherently violent and unpleasant.⁶¹ This expression was in some ways a representation of the political unrest felt by many, if not all, of these early twentieth century avant-garde artists and the political turmoil and unrest ultimately influenced these art movements to look internationally for collaboration, ideas, and inspiration.

The interest in internationalism was focused around many of the art movements located in Western Europe and a reaction to the political unrest felt by the artists of these countries following World War I. More specifically, these groups were opposed to nationalism and conservatism and “were drawn to internationalism with messianic fervor.”⁶² Groups of these Western countries wanted to embrace internationalism and advocated for the active collaboration of

ideas in their manifestos. The art created by these avant-garde groups was also a main vehicle for their ideas of collaboration internationally. Specifically, “non-figurative art became increasingly associated with a ‘free,’ international style.”⁶³

Besides collaborating with contemporary artists from other countries, many of these art movements made it a point to draw upon the artwork of non-Western cultures. The Dutch De Stijl movement’s “influence lies in the fundamental principle of its philosophy, in the concept of harmony and the suppression of individualism.”⁶⁴ The harmony and collaboration of the De Stijl movement’s art and architecture was extremely relevant in their interest in mechanization perfection.⁶⁵ This interest in technology and mechanization would be a common thread of most all of these early twentieth century avant-garde art movements.

The introduction of machines and industrialization in Europe came from, Britain and the United States in the 19th century, mainly through visitors, entrepreneurs, and international exhibitions. The industrial revolutions of both Britain and the United States quickly spread to central and eastern Europe with the introduction and embracing of new machines and technology. The middle classes of Europe were introduced to machines and the various methods of mass production at this time and these practices were soon popularized and widespread.⁶⁶ In turn, avant-garde art movements also adopted the new and exciting philosophy of modernization with fervor and embraced the progress in scientific and technical means.⁶⁷ For example, as mentioned, the Dutch De Stijl movement focused on progress, revolutionary ideas, and the explaining of these

ideas through their founder, Van Doesburg's, writings. This early movement would even have influence on the later German Bauhaus movement.⁶⁸ The avant-garde architect Le Corbusier also emphasized in his own writings the importance of mechanization and technology as an essential component of new art and architecture of the modern world. His 1927 document, *Towards a New Architecture*, expresses his positive feelings towards mass production and he strongly advocates for its infiltration in to domestic architecture. Le Corbusier writes that:

Industry on the grand scale must occupy itself with building and establish the elements of the house on a mass-production basis. We must create the mass-production spirit. The spirit of constructing mass-production houses. The spirit of living in mass-production houses. The spirit of conceiving mass-production houses.⁶⁹

This 1927 document written by Le Corbusier underscores the point that industrialization, and especially the use and means of mass production, should be embraced and utilized in all fashions by avant-garde art movements of the early twentieth century.

Part III: Futurist Manifesto

Context

Filippo Tommaso Marinetti's 1909 "The Founding and Manifesto of Futurism" was one of the first avant-garde art manifestos written at the beginning of the twentieth century. This document represents a confrontational form and left-wing philosophy that corresponds with the established stereotype of the manifesto genre. The natural evolution of movements most always begin as being of an extreme left-wing philosophy and, as will be seen, Walter Gropius' later 1919 Bauhaus Manifesto will be of a right-wing philosophy, unlike Marinetti's earlier Futurist document. Social events surrounding the writing of "The Founding and Manifesto of Futurism," as well as the personality and life of Marinetti, helped to shape the radical character of the document. Socialism was expanding throughout Italy and citizens at all class levels were struggling to adjust to the changes. Technical and mechanical developments were changing the face of labor production, and ultimately, the economic and social systems. Both the upper and lower classes were seeking a change; "[and] although their intentions were opposed, both groups demonstrated a desire, if not to overturn, at least to transform the status quo."⁷⁰ While Futurism would become an international movement, its genesis phase manifesto would address these issues associated with Italy and Italian society.

Like most other European countries, Italy was coming to terms with the introduction of technology and mass production of all forms. During the

beginning of the twentieth century, technical advancements and experimentation was occurring in northern Italy, especially within the Milan-Genoa-Turin triangle. In this area, industries were experimenting within the fields of machinery and iron and steel manufacturing.⁷¹ Because Italy was struggling with poverty and class conflicts, the country “was in need of [an] expansion toward industrialism and technology accompanied by widespread, mass participation in the administration of power.”⁷² Futurism, which arose out of this northern Italian region, recognizing this need, would make the expansion of technology a focal point in its demands. Considering “the deficiencies of a crumbling bourgeoisie and an unprepared working class, Futurism made its appearance... [with] an enthusiasm for the masses.”⁷³ Futurism was formed upon a general awareness and sense of “the masses,” which was fostered by growing advancements in mass communication and transportation.

Futurism was able to focus its intentions for “the masses” because of the growing technological advances in both mass communication and transportation. Whereas Futurism was an Italian-based movement, these advancements would help it become widely international over time as the new technology continued to connect countries across Europe. Scholar Germano Celant addressed the qualities of Futurism as a mass movement when he said:

Futurism made its appearance, its theoretical premises characterized precisely by an enthusiasm for the masses and the new means of communication...Futurism was the first artistic movement of mass society...[it] was always ‘total’ and was decided not so much by looking at the taste of the elite as at that of the masses.⁷⁴

Futurism was intended to apply to all of society and addressed a mass audience in its document in order to not limit its follower base. Marinetti's "The Founding and Manifesto of Futurism" was written ten years before Gropius' Bauhaus Manifesto and represents the original left-wing philosophy. This analysis will show that the range of art manifesto political philosophy and argument typologies began with left-wing philosophies and would evolve to include right-wing philosophies as well. Although the Futurist and Bauhaus manifestos share some commonalities in their focus upon collaboration, internationalism and embracing of technology, Futurism would lead the avant-garde art movement with an extreme left-wing initial manifesto. In short, "Futurism had irreversibly forged that fateful link between a theory of modernity and the project of the avant-garde, setting a precedent followed by all the avant-gardes to come."⁷⁵ Futurism's extreme left-wing genre exemplifies the original politically charged genre seen in early documents such as the 1848 *Communist Manifesto*. Although the overarching goal of this essay is to show that early twentieth century art manifestos range from being left-wing or right-wing documents, this section will discuss the Futurist manifesto as an example of an early and extreme left-wing document that will work to pave the way for subsequent art manifestos.

Filippo Tommaso Marinetti, the writer of "The Founding and Manifesto of Futurism," was an eccentric character and his passion towards various subjects was always reflected in his writings. As a young adult, fluent in both French and Italian, "he was a provocative student: his essays in literary criticism, damning and lauding authors with abandon, received caustic comments from his

teachers.”⁷⁶ He was also always interested in writing for publications and created his first literary magazine in 1894 at the age of seventeen.⁷⁷ Marinetti’s first publications were poems and he is recognized as a poet as well as a writer. Before founding Futurism, Marinetti wrote two books of poetry and two plays.⁷⁸ These early works would foreshadow the language and tone of his Futurist Manifesto: “many of Marinetti’s early works are fraught with a rhetoric of extraordinary violence, charged with elements of the grotesque, the macabre, the lurid.”⁷⁹ These same elements would be reflected in his 1909 “The Founding and Manifesto of Futurism.”

Marinetti originally drafted his Futurism document as a list of eleven demands; only later would he add two narrative sections to surround and supplement the list. Marinetti first wrote the “programmatic portion, the list of eleven demands, sometime in late October or November 1908...[and] in January 1909 he published [this] programmatic section as an independent two-page leaflet titled, ‘Manifesto of Futurism’.”⁸⁰ He received feedback from friends and colleagues on this list and ultimately decided to add two narrative sections to the document: one before the list and one following the list. By the middle of February 1909 Marinetti wrote this beginning narrative, which would help shape the tone and drama of the whole document. The document is now always reproduced with both the programmatic list of demands and the two narrative sections surrounding it. Using a personal connection with the French newspaper *Le Figaro*, Marinetti was able to have his writing published on the front page of the 20 February 1909 edition under the title of “The Founding and Manifesto of

Futurism.”⁸¹ While Futurism is considered to be an Italian movement, Marinetti felt that publishing his founding manifesto in a popular French newspaper was necessary for its initial distribution. In other words, “despite his ardent patriotism [Marinetti] saw that the battle had to be won or lost in Paris, the universally acknowledged center of the artistic and literary world.”⁸² Marinetti realized that the French artistic and literary circles would have to accept his movement for it to gain any popularity in the other European countries. Marinetti’s document, published in *Le Figaro*, is the official manifesto of Futurism that would shape the artistic and literary movement and will be the focus of the following analysis.

Analysis

As one of the first avant-garde art manifestos, F. T. Marinetti’s 1909 “The Founding and Manifesto of Futurism” employed the radical devices often associated with political manifestos. As scholar Cinzia Blum describes, it is “a collective statement directed at a mass audience, in which the articulation of an aesthetic and political program is transformed into a literary construct.”⁸³ “The Founding and Manifesto of Futurism” exemplifies what Rossiter describes as revolutionary radicalism and uses revolutionary arguments to enact systemic change. Revolutionary radicalism frames the current system as “diseased and oppressive” and argues passionately for a change to the status quo.⁸⁴ At this time all classes in Italian society were seeking a societal change and Futurism, as an Italian movement, utilized a revolutionary radicalism ideology to contribute to the

debate. The document begins with a seventeen-paragraph narrative that establishes key oppositions and themes of the piece. An eleven point list follows this section and is labeled as the “Manifesto of Futurism.” The document concludes with another seventeen-paragraph narrative that works to summarize the movement’s aims and ultimately gather followers. Two themes structure both the document and movement: a sense of violence and interest in technology. These themes are introduced in the beginning narrative, are explained in specific detail in the list of demands, and also resonate as final conclusions in the closing narrative section.

Marinetti begins his “The Founding and Manifesto of Futurism” with a seventeen-paragraph narrative, which is poetic in nature and has the recognizable sense of macabre that Marinetti’s writing is known for. Marinetti sets a scene of cars racing through the night and offers a juxtaposition of dark versus light and a comparison of nature and the machine while introducing the themes of violence and technology. Marinetti uses this juxtaposition of light versus dark to introduce the idea of contrast and struggles as it relates to the current struggles in Italian society. The recognition of struggles and contrast will be seen in the document’s revolutionary radical style of dramatic prose and violent actions. Marinetti opens the entire document with the statements,

We had stayed up all night, my friends and I, under hanging mosque lamps with domes of filigreed brass, domes starred like our spirits, shining like them with the prisoned radiance of electric hearts...arguing up to the last confines of logic and blackening many reams of paper with our frenzied scribbling.⁸⁵

These opening sentences introduce a juxtaposition of light and dark by contrasting words associated with brightness, such as, “shining,” “radiance,” and “electric,” with a word associated with darkness, such as, “blackness.” These statements also set a scene that evokes feelings of built up tension and energy that is waiting to be released as he describes a group of people staying up all night and writing endless pages of frenzied notes. Marinetti continues to juxtapose light and dark when he compares “stokes feeding hellish fires” with “black specters” and when he urges friends that, “‘There’s nothing to match the splendor of the sun’s red sword, slashing for the first time through our millennial gloom!’.”⁸⁶ The “gloom” is the darkness that the bright sun’s sword “slashes through.” Futurism will aim to change the political status quo with its artistic and literary movement and the introduction of contrast frames a central idea of conflict that must be resolved.

This beginning narrative also introduces a comparison of nature and the machine. This comparison is one of the revolutionary arguments that the document uses. Because technology is a new phenomenon in society at this time, it would be somewhat radical to embrace technology in the way Futurism does. Futurism advocates for the total acceptance and embrace of technology and machines and Marinetti’s symbolic opening narrative therefore compares these “machines” with fundamental elements of nature to show that technology is necessary and an integral part of “the natural world.” Marinetti compares various vehicles to objects in nature. For example, Marinetti writes, “suddenly we jumped, hearing the mighty noise of the huge double-decker trams that rumbled outside, ablaze with colored lights, like villages on holiday suddenly struck and

uprooted by the flooded Po.”⁸⁷ In the next paragraph Marinetti then describes “sickly palaces” with “the famished roar of automobiles.” With this statement he is establishing one of the fundamental beliefs of Futurism that old institutions, such as an ancient palace, will be surpassed by the excitement and need for “automobiles.” These automobiles are then described as “three snorting beasts,” and Marinetti’s own car is compared to a beached shark after it crashes. When the automobiles are anthropomorphized as animals, it emphasizes the connections between technology and the natural world. Providing a relation between technologies and the natural world, in turn, places great importance on technology and machines. The comparison fundamentally argues that technology is as important to daily life as water and plants are to nature and human living.

The idea of Death, as a subset of the theme of violence, is also introduced in this opening narrative. Death is given great importance in the document because the word is capitalized as a proper noun and it is in the guise of various animals, which gives it a concrete form and mental image. Giving Death the importance of a concrete proper noun further emphasizes the revolutionary radicalism nature of the document. Revolutionary radicalism does not dismiss violence as a means to an end and the inherently violent nature of this manifesto is seen in such descriptions such as this. For example, Marinetti writes, “Death, domesticated, met me at every turn, gracefully holding out a paw.”⁸⁸ The mental image that this sentence evokes is one of a large dog or beast that mirrors the large automotive beasts. By comparing and relating machines to nature, Futurism is able to convey its feelings that technology and machines are an integral part of

nature and must be embraced by mankind in order to progress in to the future.

This beginning narrative section introduces the reader to a feeling of conflict, with the juxtaposition of light and dark, and introduces the two major themes of violence and technology with the comparison of machines with nature. These themes are then elaborated on in the following numbered, eleven-point list labeled as the “Manifesto of Futurism.”

As previously explained, Marinetti wrote this middle programmatic list of demands first, under the title of the “Manifesto of Futurism.” This eleven-point, numbered list explicitly lays out the beliefs and demands of the Futurist movement; however, none of these points are explicitly artistic in nature, they are mainly political or social, which is why specific artistic Futurist manifestos would be written in following years. The bulleted or list form is a popular device used by manifestos in order to explain demands and aims; therefore, it seems logical that Marinetti’s “The Founding and Manifesto of Futurism” would include a list because the document closely follows the original, radical manifesto form. These eleven points clearly draw out the two themes of Futurism: violence and technology. Words and images related to violence are seen in almost every demand. This affinity for violence corresponds to the revolutionary radicalism ideology that the document exemplifies. Revolutionary radicalism is not averse to using violence in order to change the status quo, and scenes and acts of violence are clearly described in the “Manifesto of Futurism” section. The explicit demands and acts of violence also exemplify the *confrontational* form of the document. The *confrontational* form will also use dramatic means to achieve its

demands and the strict numbered list of this section relates to this form. For example, the very first demand reads, “We intend to sing the love of danger, the habit of energy and fearlessness.”⁸⁹ This first demand sets a precedent for violence for the following demands with its inclusion of “love of danger” and “habit of fearlessness.” Other scenes associated with violence are seen in subsequent points when Marinetti includes such words and phrases as, “revolt,” “aggressive action...mortal leap, the punch and the slap,” “struggle,” “violent attack,” “destructive,” “destroy,” and “riot.” These words directly relate to scenes and actions of violence and therefore continue to underscore the revolutionary radicalism nature of the document. Two demands, in particular, explicitly lay out the terms of violence as believed by the Futurist movement. Demand number seven reads, “Except in struggle, there is no more beauty. No work without an aggressive character can be a masterpiece. Poetry must be conceived as a violent attack on unknown forces, to reduce and prostrate them before man.”⁹⁰ This demand explains that only violence can yield change and is a clear revolutionary argument that it must be done in order to “fix” the status quo. Demand nine explicates the theme of violence as a revolutionary argument even more specifically as it says, “We will glorify war – the world’s only hygiene – militarism, patriotism, the destructive gesture of freedom-bringers, beautiful ideas worth dying for, and scorn for women.”⁹¹ The aim to “glorify war” is an extremely powerful statement in favor of the ultimate form of violence: mass and prolonged killings. “In the representation of war, the spectacle of human suffering is upstaged by the beautiful performance of the machine.”⁹² The inherent

connection between violence and technology, again, drives the founding forces of this movement. Marinetti then describes the proposed acts of violence, as a confrontational form, that the Futurists will take on their hated institutions that glorify the past in demand ten. The tenth point reads, “We will destroy museums, libraries, academies of every kind.”⁹³ In the eyes of the Futurists, in order for their movement to take hold, these institutions that focus on the past must be destroyed, and point ten proudly declares this feeling.

An interest in technology is also seen in most of the eleven demands in the “Manifesto of Futurism.” This obsession with technology, that Futurism displays, again underscores the revolutionary radical nature of the document. Revolutionary radicalism often goes to extremes with their desires and demands, and the Futurists obsessive love for technology and machines is a prime example. Demand four declares the Futurists’ love for technology and new machines. It states, “We say that the world’s magnificence has been enriched by a new beauty; the beauty of speed. A racing car whose hood is adorned with great pipes, like serpents of explosive breath – a roaring car that seems to ride on grapeshot – is more beautiful than the *Victory of Samothrace*.”⁹⁴ This demand highlights the Futurist movement’s love for new machines which are directly related to the idea of the future and constantly evolving technology. The proclamation that these new machines would be “more beautiful than the *Victory of Samothrace*,” a famous classical sculpture, is a prime example of a revolutionary argument meant to defy and challenge the established viewpoints in Italian society on classical art. The final demand, point eleven, also highlights technology when it mentions railway

stations, factories, locomotives and planes. More specifically, the final phrases fondly speak of these objects and again relate them to animals in nature as it describes, “deep-chested locomotives whose wheels paw the tracks like the hooves of enormous steel horses bridles by tubing; and the sleek flights of planes whose propellers chatter in the wind like banners and seem to cheer like an enthusiastic crowd.”⁹⁵ The locomotive is fondly compared to a large beast, similarly to the automobiles, and the airplanes are fondly compared to a representation of “the masses”: a cheering crowd. These comparisons highlight the importance and significance of technology and machines in the ideals of Futurism.

A closing narrative section follows the list of demands title the “Manifesto of Futurism.” Similarly to the opening narrative, this closing section is also seventeen-paragraphs in length. The closing section solidifies the revolutionary radicalism nature of the document as it reinforces the two themes of violence and technology. Marinetti also uses this section to leave the reader with a clear understanding of the ultimate aim of Futurism: to leave the past behind and constantly work towards the future to produce change. The section begins with a powerful opening paragraph that highlights all of the themes and beliefs introduced in the opening narrative and list of demands. The paragraph reads:

It is from Italy that we launch through the world this violently upsetting, incendiary manifesto of ours. With it, today, we establish *Futurism* because we want to free this land from its smelly gangrene of professors, archaeologists, ciceroni, and antiquarians. For too long has Italy been a dealer in secondhand clothes. We mean to free her from the numberless museums that cover her like so many graveyards.⁹⁶

The first sentence explains how Futurism is an Italian based movement, but that it will be international and adopted through Europe. The sentence again emphasizes the revolutionary radicalism nature of the document by acknowledging that the document is a “violently upsetting, incendiary manifesto.” Unlike the Bauhaus Manifesto, which was not labeled as a manifesto, “The Founding and Manifesto of Futurism” is not only titled as a manifesto, but also repeats the term within its text and adopts the original revolutionary radical form of the manifesto document. The remaining statements of this opening paragraph specifically lay out the ideals and aims of the Futurist movement: “to free [Italy] from its smelly gangrene of professors, archaeologists, ciceroni, and antiquarians...to free her from the numberless museums,” or in other words, to leave the past behind and continuously push forward in to the future.

This closing section continues to use revolutionary arguments as it relates museums and other similar institutions to death and decay on multiple occasions. These harsh comparisons exemplify a typical dramatic, revolutionary argument. For example, Marinetti compares museums to cemeteries where art lies beside each other forever to decay and rot. He argues that, “admiring an old picture is the same as pouring our sensibility into a funerary urn,” and “that daily visits to museums, libraries, and academies is, for artists...damaging.”⁹⁷ Instead, Marinetti urges followers to not “worship to past” by visiting museums but to look towards the future for inspiration, rooted in “violent spasms of actions and creation.” To achieve these means, he continues to use the language of revolutionary arguments

by urging followers of Futurism to “set fire to the library shelves,” and “turn aside the canals to flood the museums.”⁹⁸ These violent actions of destroying the past will fuel the aims and desires of Futurism and exemplify the revolutionary arguments used by the movement.

Marinetti is able to reinforce his aims of Futurism by conceding to the fact that he is already thirty and therefore almost old, and that he will be replaced by the new young Futurists soon enough. This idea, again, exemplifies the revolutionary radicalism nature of the document as it already specifically addresses future, younger followers of the movement. He states, “When we are forty, other younger and stronger men will probably throw us in the wastebasket like useless manuscripts – we want it to happen!”⁹⁹ By encouraging followers of Futurism to constantly replace the older members, Marinetti further enforces the aim of Futurism to be young and constantly evolving by always looking towards the future for inspiration and change. He describes these new and younger Futurists as violently throwing out Marinetti and his older comrades, in the air of revolutionary radicalism, and relates the scene to artistic creation by saying that “art, in fact, can be nothing but violence, cruelty, and injustice.”¹⁰⁰

Marinetti then uses a statement in the fourteenth paragraph, and repeats it again as the closing statement of the entire document. It reads, “Erect on the summit of the world, once again we hurl our defiance at the stars!”¹⁰¹ This exclamation relates back to the description given in the opening narrative section of “an army of hostile stars glaring down at us from their celestial encampments.”¹⁰² These statements further underline the feelings of oppositions

and juxtaposition as felt throughout Italian society. Futurism was a revolutionary radical movement looking to change the status quo and openly recognized the violent struggle between classes and society. While Futurism became mainly an artistic and literary movement, it was originally provoked in to being by the societal and class struggles of Italy at the beginning of the twentieth century. Futurism wished to change the status quo by urging followers to disregard the past and to embrace the future. Futurists proposed this change through violence and the open acceptance and use of technology.

Because Marinetti's "The Founding and Manifesto of Futurism" simply founded the movement and did not provide an aesthetic program for the production of Futurist art, many other manifestos were written to provide specific guidelines for the production of Futurist artworks. There is a plethora of subsequent Futurist manifestos ranging from specific manifestos on painting and sculpture, to theater and fashion design and even a manifesto on Futurist cooking. It is important to highlight the fact that Marinetti's "The Founding and Manifesto of Futurism" did not provide a specific aesthetic program for Futurist art, and I will therefore briefly mention the structure of one of the subsequent Futurist manifestos.¹⁰³ In 1910, Umberto Boccioni, Carlo Carrà, Luigi Russolo, Giacomo Balla and Gino Severini, important followers of Futurism, wrote the "Manifesto of the Futurist Painters." This manifesto provided a specific aesthetic program for the production of Futurist painting. Similarly to Marinetti's founding manifesto, this manifesto is also of a revolutionary radicalism philosophy and uses revolutionary arguments in its writing. It is also structured with a narrative and

programmatic list of aesthetic demands. It uses dramatic rhetoric and exclamatory sentences to invoke a feeling of violence, similar to the founding ideas and themes of Futurism. Its seventh point provides a Futurist take on painting when it says, “(7) Sweep the whole field of art clean of all themes and subjects which have been used in the past.”¹⁰⁴ The other Futurist manifestos¹⁰⁵ also follow the general structure, as established by Marinetti’s 1909 “The Founding and Manifesto of Futurism,” and aim to provide specific aesthetic programs for the production of art within the Futurist movement.

Marinetti’s 1909 “The Founding and Manifesto of Futurism” exemplifies the original manifesto form in its adoption of a revolutionary radical ideology and its use of revolutionary arguments in its demands. However, as will be seen in the later Bauhaus Manifesto, not all art movement manifestos adopt this original form. These manifestos, in fact, range across a spectrum of ideologies from the radical to the moderate. “The Founding and Manifesto of Futurism” offered a striking precedent for the avant-garde art manifesto that would be both copied and adapted in subsequent art manifestos of the early twentieth century.

Part IV: Bauhaus Manifesto

Context

Passionate discussions and important events fostered the writing of Walter Gropius' "Program of the Staatliche Bauhaus in Weimar" in April of 1919. This document included an opening writing, later translated and labeled by scholars as the Bauhaus Manifesto as well as a complete curriculum program for a new art school in Weimar, Germany. Gropius had been committed to changing the mode of art education before World War I and was finally given a chance when appointed as the new successor to the Academy of Art in Weimar, Germany; after the war ended.¹⁰⁶ After the war Gropius was appointed as the Weimar Academy of Art's director and combined the two government funded schools, the Grand-Ducal Academy of Art and the Grand-Ducal Academy of Arts and Crafts, to form a new school of design.¹⁰⁷ Gropius used his new leadership to completely re-structure the arts education curriculum and introduce a new philosophy regarding the relationship between art and design. He wrote many letters to the government to try and gather their support for the changes he wished to make to the school's curriculum. One such letter written to the Grand-Ducal Saxon State Ministry on January 25, 1916 was entitled: "Recommendations for the Founding of an Educational Institution as an Artistic Counseling Service for Industry, the Trades, and the Crafts." In this letter, Gropius expressed to the ministry that, "whereas in the old days the entire body of a man's products was manufactured exclusively by hand, today only a rapidly disappearing small portion of the world's goods is produced without the aid of machines."¹⁰⁸ Gropius supplied the government with

reasons for altering the school's curriculum to focus exclusively on applied art and industrial art in their pursuit of art and design. This idea would become the fundamental philosophy of the Bauhaus and the central thesis of the Bauhaus Manifesto.

The origin of the Bauhaus name reflects the connection between Gropius' movement and the state. Because the newly combined school was funded by the government, Gropius had to petition them to propose the name change. Gropius wrote to the government in March 1919 to request a change in the school's name from the combined Academy of Art and School of Arts and Crafts to the Staatliche Bauhaus. In April of 1919, the name change was granted and Gropius immediately proposed his new program. This new name emphasized the government funding of the school: "Staatliche" meaning "state," and the overall philosophy proposed by Gropius about the new school of design: "Bauhaus" meaning "building house" or "house of building." "By adopting the name 'Bauhaus' and aligning the institution with the concept of a 'big building project,' [Gropius] employed avant-gardist strategies" in his new school curriculum and overall philosophies.¹⁰⁹ This passionate new philosophy would be the driving force behind Gropius' manifesto and program for the Staatliche Bauhaus which he wrote and distributed in April of 1919.

The "Program of the Staatliche Bauhaus," which includes the introductory section, known today as the "Bauhaus Manifesto," was originally published as a four-page leaflet in April of 1919. Prospective students and teachers had access to this publication and its initial distribution attracted many with its dynamic

language and exciting prospects. After circulating among the young Germans, the publication attracted hundreds of students, eventually enrolling 150 students, half of them women, and forced an early opening of the newly combined and re-named school in Weimar, Germany.¹¹⁰ Some of the first faculty members at the Weimar Bauhaus included: the Swiss Johannes Itten and Paul Klee, the German Gertrud Grunow, Gunta Stoltz and Oscar Schlemmer, the American Lyonel Feininger, the Russian Wassily Kandinsky, and the Hungarian Lazlo Moholy-Nagy, along with many other international artists and craftsmen. As the first compiled faculty of the Weimar Bauhaus suggests, Gropius' manifesto united artists and craftsmen, from international backgrounds, to work and create together.

Of course, obstacles arose during the first few years of the Staatliche Bauhaus. The school was not immune to conflicts with other schools, artists, and the government. Some local artists opposed the appointment of Gropius to this newly formed school. Some old professors of the original academy resigned from their positions when Gropius became the director and re-vamped the teaching style. A slander campaign was "launched by nationalist circles and friends of [these] old academy professors against Gropius, which attempted to cast doubts on the legality of his appointment to Weimar and the founding of the Bauhaus."¹¹¹ With mounting animosity toward the school, the government informed the then director Mies van der Rohe that, for economic reasons, it could no longer support the school. Because it was technically illegal to disband a state-run facility, the government instead slowly reduced the school's funding.¹¹² This state-run school

was politically motivated in the choice and appointment of staff and this new right-wing government did not approve of the small number of German faculty member and ultimately cut fifty-percent of funding in 1924.¹¹³ As a result, the Staatliche Bauhaus eventually was forced to move from Weimar, Germany; to Dessau, Germany; in 1925, where it was simply known as the Bauhaus.¹¹⁴ After the three changes of location and the persistent conflicts with the government, the Bauhaus school was eventually closed by the Nazi government in 1933, “under the pretext that the Bauhaus had printed and distributed Communist pamphlets.”¹¹⁵ Although the school itself was short lived, a mere fourteen years, its influence on modern design is unprecedented, and its radical preliminary course, where students learned the elements of design, has been repeatedly modeled by other art schools thereafter.

Analysis

Walter Gropius’ 1919 “Program of the Staatliche Bauhaus in Weimar” leaflet opens with four introductory paragraphs, which has been translated and titled by scholars¹¹⁶ as the Bauhaus Manifesto. The “manifesto” faces opposite a woodcut print done by Lyonel Feininger (Figure 2) and the following two pages lay out a detailed curriculum program for the new school (Figure 3). Recent reprinting, however, has only reproduced the introductory paragraphs and the woodcut print under the label of “Bauhaus Manifesto.” The subsequent result is that the program curriculum is rarely paired with the manifesto. Gropius labeled

this entire leaflet under the German word “Programm” which does not completely translate in to the English word “manifesto.” The fact that Gropius did not label his introductory paragraphs with the German word for manifesto, “das manifest,” and yet English translations label it as a manifesto, further supports my argument that contemporary scholarship generalizes the Bauhaus manifesto as being politically driven and left-wing in terms of its philosophy and argument typology. Although it may be argued that Gropius did not intend for his writing to be labeled as such, the context of the piece clearly lends itself to be classified as a manifesto; allowing it to be thought that Gropius intended the piece to mark a significant break in arts education. As this analysis will explicate, it is more accurate for manifestos, such as the Bauhaus manifesto, to be understood within a spectrum of ideologies and arguments when they can in fact be of either left-wing or right-wing political philosophies and argument typologies. Because English reproductions refer to the introductory paragraphs and corresponding woodcut print as the Bauhaus Manifesto, it will be called such in this essay; however, it is impertinent to keep in mind the originally intended titling when discussing the form and language of the document and its placement along a spectrum of typologies and arguments.

Gropius’ Bauhaus Manifesto can be placed along Rossiter’s political spectrum as a product of the reaction typology. The whole document focuses around the exigency that artists and designers must return to the fundamentals of crafts and building in their approach to art. Gropius exclaims within the manifesto that, “architects, sculptors, painters, we must all return to the crafts!”¹¹⁷ This

central argument supports the underlying philosophy of Gropius and this new art school. In order to support this general reaction-typology argument, Gropius uses the restorative argument to express the grievances. This style of argumentation tries to explain why a society went astray and offers solutions of how to restore it to what is thought of as the “better times.” Gropius references other points in artistic history, such as the Gothic era,¹¹⁸ as examples of “better times,” and therefore argues a return to them. For example, he argues:

To embellish buildings was once the noblest function of the fine arts...today the arts exist in isolation, from which they can be rescued only through the conscious, cooperative effort of all craftsmen...[art schools] must be merged once more with the workshop... we must all return to the crafts!¹¹⁹

Gropius uses such restorative phrases as “was once,” “be rescued,” “merged once more,” and “must return.” These words and phrases help to foster the sense and urgency of restoring the general philosophy of art and design to times, such as the Gothic era, when they were more associated with crafts. The restorative style of argumentation also rarely uses violence in its demands, and Gropius also never alludes to violence as a means to these ends, contrary to what was seen in the 1909 Futurist Manifesto. In the document, Gropius articulates his desire to return to the past by utilizing new ideas and philosophies in his restorative arguments.

One of Gropius’ main solutions for achieving this ultimate goal of a new philosophy, of art and design and the subsequent teaching of it, focuses on the idea of collaboration and a general sense of “we.” As seen by the initial demographics of faculty in the opening years of the Bauhaus, this collaboration is

defined as international faculty of all types of artists and craftsmen, and the collaboration of crafts and fine arts.¹²⁰ In describing all of these kinds of collaboration, Gropius uses such words and phrases as “cooperative effort of all craftsmen,” “unity,” “together,” “we,” and “us.” The scattering of these words, which evoke and describe collaboration, further emphasize the overarching call for collaboration. Gropius mentions the need for both artists and craftsmen to come together again multiple times throughout his manifesto. Twice, he uses the combined subject of “architects, painters, and sculptors.” In the opening paragraph he urges, “Architects, painters, and sculptors must recognize anew and learn to grasp the composite character of a building both as an entity and in its separate parts;” and, in the third paragraph, he passionately exclaims that “architects, sculptors, painters, we all must return to the crafts!”¹²¹ Gropius uses the combined subject of “architects, painters, and sculptors” to imply the combined forces of all artists and craftsmen. Readers know that he includes all artists and craftsmen together in this new school of thought, because the Staatliche Bauhaus curriculum includes courses offering a range from architecture, painting, sculpture, to stonemasonry, metalsmithing, weaving, carpentry, and glass painting. Although Gropius calls for the collaboration between all artists and craftsmen, he does highlight architecture as the ultimate form of art and design. He opens his manifesto with the statement that, “the ultimate aim of all visual arts is the complete building!”¹²² This statement establishes a hierarchy within art and design that places architecture as the principle craft. He goes on to explain how artists must understand the “character

of a building,” so that “their work [will] be imbued with the architectonic spirit which it has lost,” and that “the mere drawing and painting world of the pattern designer and the applied artist must become a world that builds again.”¹²³ These three statements complicate the general spirit of collaboration because Gropius calls for collaboration, however, the collaboration idea is under his terms because he was an architect by profession. Gropius’ terms dictate that collaboration of designs and materials must be infused with a central “architectonic spirit,” or, in other words, a general understanding of building.

In describing this new collaboration between both artists and craftsmen, Gropius proposes not only a new type of art school, but also a new way of envisioning artistic creation. For example, Gropius closes his manifesto with the paragraph:

Let us then create a new guild of craftsmen without the class distinctions that raise an arrogant barrier between craftsman and artist! Together let us desire, conceive and create the new structure of the future, which will embrace architecture and sculpture and painting in one unity and which will one day rise toward heaven from the hands of a million workers like the crystal symbol of a new faith.¹²⁴

This closing paragraph effectively summarizes the essence of Gropius’ goal of collaboration across all of the aforementioned aspects: collaboration between artist and craftsman and collaboration of all ideas and materials. This final paragraph is also strongly enhanced by Lyonel Feininger’s woodcut print¹²⁵ (Figure 2) that faces opposite the manifesto text. Feininger’s woodcut is the visual equivalent of the goals of the manifesto that are definitively explained in the manifesto’s final paragraph. This woodcut print displays a highly geometric

representation of a cathedral amidst shining stars. The overall composition is pyramidal and harkens back to the hierarchy of collaboration idea that Gropius established. The image of a “shining” cathedral as the single image associated with this manifesto emphasizes the fact that building and architecture must be a central spirit of all art. This cathedral is also represented in a sharp geometric fashion with dynamic striations that also exemplify building and the art of building in a Gothic style. The general construction and composition of a cathedral also encompasses many different artistic designs and constructions. Cathedrals include stonemasonry, carpentry, stained glass, paintings and frescos, sculpture, and weaving. All of these media are included as courses of crafts and design in Gropius’ following curriculum program of the school. Finally, overall, Gropius closes his manifesto with the statement that this new “unity...will one day rise toward heaven from the hands of a million workers like the crystal symbol of a new faith.”¹²⁶ The shining stars that surround the cathedral and its central arrangement in the composition clearly visually represents final statement of the manifesto.

Although there are certainly general similarities between early political manifestos, such as the 1848 *Communist Manifesto*, and an avant-garde art manifesto like Gropius’ Bauhaus Manifesto, there are noteworthy distinctions that distinguish a right-wing restorative manifesto from a more left-wing radical manifesto such as Marinetti’s “The Founding and Manifesto of Futurism”. Most scholarship has generally analyzed all manifestos under the pretext that they are extreme left-wing in their political philosophies and argument typologies;

however, as this analysis has displayed, some manifestos are right-wing in their language and goals. As mentioned earlier, Gropius did not even label his document as a manifesto; however, in keeping with the generalization, scholarship and reproductions have all labeled it as such, and therefore have incorrectly categorized its language, political philosophy, and arguments. The political *Communist Manifesto* defined a clear separation of bourgeoisie and proletariat classes in their description of grievances using the *confrontational* form. This manifesto aimed to create a definite distinction and therefore create strong oppositional enemies to better highlight their oppression and gather followers to achieve its goals. Conversely, the Bauhaus Manifesto used the *managerial* form and called for collaboration and cooperation to achieve its goals and aims. The manifesto not only generally advocated for a re-joining of artists and craftsmen, but it also recognized and asked for all German artists to join together in order to produce the change. Harnessing an air of cooperation under the *managerial* form, allows for a more peaceful, and overall effective, long-lasting change.

While the Bauhaus Manifesto uses some typical elements of a manifesto argument, such as commanding language, “we” and “us” pronouns, grievances discussed in the past tense, and goals discussed in the present and future tense, this analysis has shown that the document is of a *managerial* form and does not fit in with the scholarship’s generalization that all manifestos are radical and of the *confrontational* form. The Bauhaus Manifesto’s goals advocated for a change in the way of thinking about and producing art. Gropius even remarked later on in

his 1943 book, *Scope of Total Architecture*, that his conception of the Bauhaus idea involved the fact that after World War I “every thinking man felt the necessity for an intellectual change of front.”¹²⁷ The Bauhaus manifesto supports my argument that manifestos cannot be generalized as documents of left-wing political philosophies and argument typologies, but are rather, each different and lie upon a spectrum of political philosophies and argument typologies ranging from left-wing to right-wing.

Conclusion

Studies of the manifesto genre are often based on an understanding of Marx and Engels' 1848 *Communist Manifesto* as the first example of a manifesto. Scholars cite this early manifesto as a model that subsequent manifestos adopted and/or copied and as a result, the manifesto has often been associated with radical political tracts even though it has been a tool used by both political and social movements. As this essay revealed, avant-garde art manifestos of the early twentieth century did not consistently follow the original model of the early political manifestos in terms of their political philosophies and argument typologies. Scholar Clinton Rossiter's Political Spectrum (Figure 1) was used to classify the various art manifestos in to specific political philosophies and argument typologies. This conceptual diagram allows for a clear distinction between the left-wing philosophies, the moderate or centrist philosophies, and the right-wing philosophies. As seen in this essay, the avant-garde art manifestos either classified in to the left-wing philosophies (revolutionary radicalism and radicalism) or the right-wing philosophies (revolutionary reaction and reaction), and do not fall within the moderate or centrist philosophies (liberalism, conservatism, and standpattism). Scholar Robert Cathcart's study of social movement rhetoric also helped to classify whether the manifestos employed either the *confrontational* or *managerial* form. As discussed earlier, the original political manifestos, such as the 1848 *Communist Manifesto*, were products of the left-wing political philosophies and argument typologies and employed the *confrontational* form. This essay has argued that it is incorrect to assume that

avant-garde art manifestos follow the same preceded format of early political manifestos. More accurately, these artistic manifestos classify in to either the left-wing or right-wing political philosophies and argument typologies and can employ either the *confrontational* or *managerial* form.

The early twentieth century fostered many avant-garde artistic movements and most of these movements wrote manifestos. This essay focused on F.T. Marinetti's 1909 "The Founding and Manifesto of Futurism" and Walter Gropius' 1919 Bauhaus Manifesto because these two manifestos represented the two ends of Rossiter's political spectrum. "The Founding and Manifesto of Futurism" employed a left-wing revolutionary radicalism philosophy, used revolutionary arguments, and utilized the *confrontational* form; whereas the Bauhaus Manifesto employed a right-wing reaction philosophy, used restorative arguments, and utilized the *managerial* form. Focusing on "The Founding and Manifesto of Futurism" and the Bauhaus Manifesto offers a general framing of the two ends of the spectrum upon which all of these early twentieth century avant-garde art manifestos fit upon.

In order to solidify my argument that the two manifestos analyzed in this essay represent the two ends of the spectrum upon which all the subsequent avant-garde art manifestos fit upon, a general overview of a few of these subsequent manifestos will be included. Some of the main early twentieth century avant-garde art movements that wrote manifestos include the 1914 Vorticist movement, the 1918 Dada movement, the 1918 De Stijl movement, and the 1924 Surrealist movement. These movements' manifestos are easily classified along the political

spectrum framed by my analysis of “The Founding and Manifesto of Futurism” and the Bauhaus Manifesto. These other art manifestos fit within either the left-wing or right-wing political philosophies and argument typologies of the movement and therefore further support my overarching argument.

The 1914 Vorticist manifesto, written by R. Aldington, Gaudier-Brzeska, E. Pound, W. Roberts, E. Wadsworth, and Wyndham Lewis and entitled “Beyond Action and Reaction” recognizes these two extremes of the political spectrum and art manifesto genre explicitly in its title: action and reaction. “Action” can be associated with the left-wing political philosophies and argument typologies and “reaction” can be associated with the right-wing political philosophies and argument typologies. The manifesto’s second point acknowledges these two spectrum ends by stating that, “2) We start from opposite statements of a chosen world. Set up violent structure of adolescent clearness between two extremes.”¹²⁸ The Vorticists, however, choose to disassociate themselves with both extremes when they write, “4) We fight first on one side, then on the other, but always for the SAME cause, which is neither side or both sides and ours.”¹²⁹ This statement attempts to establish that the followers will follow neither extreme, however, the manifesto can be classified as left-wing radical because it later says that, “5) This is also the reason why a movement towards art and imagination could burst up here, from this lump of compressed life, with more force than anywhere else.”¹³⁰ Although the Vorticists are claiming that they advocate for neither extreme side, they still acknowledge the idea that their movement could “burst through” and

dominate the art world at some point. This dramatic statement classifies the manifesto as left-wing radical and displays an innovational argument.

The 1918 “Dada Manifesto” written by Tristan Tzara also aims to disassociate itself from the extremes of art and art manifestos by advocating for extreme individuality and a philosophy it labels, “Idon’tgiveadamnism;” however in doing this, it proves to be a right-wing reaction philosophy that uses retentive arguments. Tzara advocates for extreme disassociation when he writes, “I am against systems, the most acceptable system is one of not having a system.”¹³¹ He then explains his philosophy of “Idon’tgiveadamnism” as “the state of a life where each person keeps his own conditions.”¹³² These statements begin the manifesto and may cause a reader to deduce that this manifesto might not fit in to any of the philosophies along Rossiter’s spectrum. The end of the manifesto, however, provides the evidence that the Dada movement and manifesto is, in fact, of a right-wing reaction philosophy that uses retentive arguments. Near the end of the manifesto, Tzara writes, “So DADA was born of a desire for independence, or a distrust of the community. Those who belong to us keep their freedom. We don’t recognize any theory. We have had enough of cubist and futurist academies: laboratories of formal ideas.”¹³³ The fact that Tzara openly denounces the Cubist and Futurist movements proves that Dada is reacting to the previous artistic styles and will disregard these earlier “radical” movements with this retentive argument. While Tzara attempts to offer a movement philosophy that is completely separate from the previous artistic movement philosophies, the manifesto genre reveals

itself within the document and his writing still fits with one end of the spectrum: the right-wing reaction philosophy.

The 1918 “Manifesto I of De Stijl” written by Theo van Doesburg and other followers¹³⁴ exemplifies a left-wing radicalism philosophy and uses innovational arguments in its numbered list of ideas and demands. The document reveals that it is left-wing radicalism and not right-wing reaction because it describes the fact that “the old is connected with the individual [and] the new is connected with the universal.”¹³⁵ Later in the document the “individual despotism” is denounced and therefore shows that the movement does not wish to restore back to earlier times, as a reaction philosophy would advocate. Instead, the movement wishes to combine both the individual and universal with the help of community and international unity. Point three states, “3) The new art has brought forward what the new consciousness of time contains: a balance between the universal and the individual.”¹³⁶ Point seven then goes on to explain the, “the artists of today...sympathize with all who work to establish international unity in life, art, culture either intellectually or materially.”¹³⁷ These ideas represent innovational arguments in their aims to use international unity and collaboration in both art and culture.

One of the early Surrealist documents written by the initial followers¹³⁸ of the movement entitled “Declaration of January 27, 1925,” functions like a manifesto and actually corresponds with the Futurist model by being of the left-wing revolutionary radicalism philosophy and also uses revolutionary arguments. Similar diction and ideas used in “The Founding and Manifesto of Futurism” are

also found in this Surrealist document. For example, the document uses such words as “revolution” and “revolt.” It says, “3) We are determined to make a revolution,” and “8) We are specialists in Revolt. There is no means of action which we are not capable, when necessary, of employing.”¹³⁹ Declaring that they will use any means of action necessary to complete their demands is an example of a revolutionary argument not opposed to violence or violent actions. The clear mention of starting a revolution most explicitly emphasizes its revolutionary radicalism philosophy. This Surrealist declaration is the one document that most closely adheres to the political philosophy and argument typology of the extreme left-wing “The Founding and Manifesto of Futurism.”

This general classification of the four other major avant-garde art manifestos of the early twentieth century supports my argument that “The Founding and Manifesto of Futurism” and the Bauhaus Manifesto offer a clear framing of the spectrum upon which these art manifestos lie. “The Founding and Manifesto of Futurism” represents the extreme left-wing end of the spectrum while the Bauhaus Manifesto represents the right-wing end of the spectrum and these four other manifestos fall between these two extremes. Further analysis could now be conducted for these four subsequent manifestos to show their significance along the political spectrum.

It is also interesting to note the evolution of both the Futurist and Bauhaus movements in the years after their manifestos were written. As discussed, the Futurist movement produced many more manifestos pertaining to specific artistic processes and the movement would eventually become even more political as

they aligned themselves with Fascism in Italy. The Bauhaus movement, however, would move from being a right-wing, less radical movement, to being a more radical left-wing movement as a result of Walter Gropius' address to the first Bauhaus exhibition in 1923. The theme of this address was "a new unity" and Gropius called for the full acceptance and embrace of technology in machines. Whereas in his original Bauhaus Manifesto, Gropius advocated for the return to handicrafts, this 1923 address advocated for the move from handicrafts to the present age of machines and technology for art and design.¹⁴⁰ Embracing technology and machines, much like the Futurists did in their founding manifesto, shows that the Bauhaus movement, in fact, moved from being right-wing and less radical to being left-wing and more radical. It would be interesting to study the evolution of other avant-garde art movements of the early twentieth century to see if their ideals and goals also changed along the political philosophy spectrum. The Bauhaus movement's evolution furthers my argument that these avant-garde art movements and manifestos were flexible and able to move along this political spectrum of philosophies and argument styles.

This essay ultimately aimed to offer a new framework in which to study early twentieth century avant-garde art manifestos. A rhetorical framing of these documents offers a new perspective on the documents in order to enhance the art historical understanding of these movements. Because preceding scholarship has grouped most manifestos in to the genre of extreme left-wing political philosophies and argument typologies that utilize the *confrontational* form, the avant-garde art manifestos were incorrectly placed in to this category as well.

This essay offered a solution to the gap in scholarship on the topic by arguing that these avant-garde art manifestos can be classified as either products of left-wing or right-wing political philosophies and argument typologies. These avant-garde art manifestos lie across a spectrum of political philosophies and argument typologies and can be either *confrontational* or *managerial* in form. This essay focused on two manifestos, each one from one end of the philosophy spectrum. By explicitly analyzing the left-wing 1909 “The Founding and Manifesto of Futurism” and the right-wing 1919 Bauhaus Manifesto, a clear framework is established for other avant-garde art manifestos to be analyzed under. In all, this essay will not only add to the scholarship of both rhetorical studies and art historical studies, but will also foster the continued analysis of other avant-garde art manifestos of the early twentieth century.

Endnotes

¹ Janet Lyon’s book, *Manifestoes: Provocations of the Modern*; Mary Ann Caws’ book, *Manifesto: a Century of Isms*; and Andrew Wilson’s article, “Gustav Metzger’s Auto-Destructive/Auto-Creative Art: An Art of Manifesto, 1958-1969.

² Although most literature would label this as “manifesto form,” this essay will use genre in place of form. The term “form” will be used when describing scholar Robert Cathcart’s social movements’ *confrontational* vs. *managerial* forms.

³ Although most literature would use the label “radical” this essay will use the term “left-wing” to describe more radical documents and “right-wing” to describe less radical documents. These left-wing and right-wing philosophies will represent two ends of Rossiter’s Political Spectrum which will be explained later on in the essay.

⁴ Kimber Charles Pearce, “The Radical Feminist Manifesto as Generic Appropriation: Gender, Genre, and Second Wave Resistance,” *The Southern Communications Journal* 64, no. 4 (Summer 1999), 307.

⁵ Political philosophies and argument typologies as defined by Clinton Rossiter’s “Political Spectrum.” (See Figure 1).

⁶ Janet Lyon, *Manifestoes: Provocations of the Modern* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1999), 14.

⁷ Lyon references the *Communist Manifesto* around five different times throughout this first chapter on pages 14, 27, 29, and 39.

⁸ Mary Ann Caws, ed., *Manifesto: a century of isms* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2001), ix.

⁹ Lyon, *Manifestoes: Provocations of the Modern*, 185.

¹⁰ Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, "Communist Manifesto," in *Birth of the Communist Manifesto: with full text of the Manifesto, all prefaces by Marx and Engels, early drafts by Engels and other supplementary material*, ed. Dirk J. Struik (New York: International Publishers, 1971), 112.

¹¹ Lyon, *Manifestoes: Provocations of the Modern*, 31.

¹² Marx and Engels, "Communist Manifesto," 125.

¹³ Charles J. Stewart, Craig Allen Smith, and Robert E. Denton, *Persuasion and Social Movements* (Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press, 2007), 225.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 225-226.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 226.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 226-227.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 227.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 230.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 230-232.

²² *Ibid.*, 232-233.

²³ *Ibid.*, 233.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 236.

²⁵ *Ibid.*

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 237.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 238.

²⁸ Cooper, Martha D., and William L. Nothstine, *Power Persuasion: Moving an Ancient Art into the Media Age 2nd* ed. (The Educational Video Group, 1996), 271.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 179.

³⁰ Robert S. Cathcart, "Movements: Confrontation as Rhetorical Form," in *Methods of Rhetorical Criticism: A Twentieth-Century Perspective*, 3rd rev. ed., eds. Bernard L. Brock, Robert L. Scott, and James W. Chesebro (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1989), 362.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 362-363.

³² *Ibid.*, 363.

³³ *Ibid.*, 364.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 365.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 366.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 368.

³⁷ Dirk J. Struik, ed. *Birth of the Communist Manifesto: with full text of the Manifesto, all prefaces by Marx and Engels, early drafts by Engels and other supplementary material* (New York: International Publishers, 1971), 62.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 67.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 12.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 63.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 64.

⁴² *Ibid.*

⁴³ Caws, *Manifestos: a century of isms*, xx.

⁴⁴ Lyon, *Manifestoes: Provocations of the Modern*, 11.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 9.

⁴⁶ Caws, *Manifesto: a century of isms*, xxvi.

⁴⁷ Marx and Engels, "Communist Manifesto," 105.

-
- ⁴⁸ Caws also brings attention to this point by stating that the manifesto is suited by “the rapid enumeration of elements in a list or bullet form” (Caws p. xxvi).
- ⁴⁹ Lyon, *Manifestoes: Provocations of the Modern*, 14-15.
- ⁵⁰ Caws, *Manifesto: a century of isms*, xx.
- ⁵¹ Lyon, *Manifestoes: Provocations of the Modern*, 15.
- ⁵² This performance style of rhetoric references back to the earliest rhetors and philosophers who lived in a time when the practice of rhetoric was mainly public speaking.
- ⁵³ Andrew Wilson, “Gustav Metzger’s Auto-Destructive/Auto-Creative Art: An Art of Manifesto, 1959-1969,” *Third Text* 22, no. 2 (March 2008), 179. <http://www.tandf.co.uk/journals> (accessed November 15, 2009).
- ⁵⁴ Mandy Merck, “Mulvey’s Manifesto,” *Camera Obscura* 66 22, no. 3 (2007), 7.
- ⁵⁵ Some other well known avant-garde art movements of the early twentieth-century that wrote manifestos were Vorticism, De Stijl, Dada, and Surrealism.
- ⁵⁶ Some well known examples include: the British Vorticist and Surrealist movements, the German Bauhaus, Die Brücke, and Der Blaue Reiter movements, the Italian Futurist movement, and the Zurich based Dada movement, as well as many other lesser known avant-garde art movements that sprung up throughout Europe during these years. Many of these movements, such as Futurism and Dada, would even become international.
- ⁵⁷ Robert Rosenblum, “Other Romantic Currents: Klee to Ernst,” in *Major European Art Movements, 1900-1945: A Critical Anthology*, eds. Patricia Kaplan and Susan Manso (New York: E. P. Dutton, 1977), 92.
- ⁵⁸ Frances Spalding, *British Art Since 1900* (London: Thames and Hudson Ltd, 1986), 111.
- ⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 110-111.
- ⁶⁰ “Avant-garde” is a French military word that is adopted to describe art movements that are ahead of the world and times in terms of their style and philosophies. These avant-garde artists were considered to be radical and most European governments feared their possible actions.
- ⁶¹ Robert Goldwater, “The Primitivism of the Fauves, the Brücke, The Primitivism of the Blaue Reiter,” in *Major European Art Movements, 1900-1945: A Critical Anthology*, eds. Patricia Kaplan and Susan Manso (New York: E. P. Dutton, 1977), 72.
- ⁶² Timothy O. Benson and Éva Forgács, eds., *Between Worlds: a sourcebook of central European avant-gardes, 1910-1930* (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 2002), 23.
- ⁶³ Spalding, *British Art Since 1900*, 112.
- ⁶⁴ Hans L. C. Jaffé, “Introduction to De Stijl,” in *Major European Art Movements, 1900-1945: A Critical Anthology*, eds. Patricia Kaplan and Susan Manso (New York: E. P. Dutton, 1977), 225.
- ⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 246.
- ⁶⁶ Benson and Forgács, *Between Worlds*, 20.
- ⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 23.
- ⁶⁸ Jaffé, “Introduction to De Stijl,” 223.
- ⁶⁹ Le Corbusier, *Towards a New Architecture*, trans. Frederick Etchells (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1960), 210.
- ⁷⁰ Germano Celant, “Futurism as Mass Avant-Garde,” in *Futurism: and the International Avant-Garde*, by Anne d’Harnoncourt (Philadelphia: Philadelphia Museum of Art, 1980-1981), 35.
- ⁷¹ *Ibid.*
- ⁷² *Ibid.*
- ⁷³ *Ibid.*
- ⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 35-36.
- ⁷⁵ Lawrence Rainey, “Introduction: F.T. Marinetti and the Development of Futurism,” in *Futurism: An Anthology*, eds. Lawrence Rainey, Christine Poggi, and Laura Wittman (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2009), 1.
- ⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 2.
- ⁷⁷ *Ibid.*

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 2-3.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, 3.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 5-6.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 6.

⁸² Anne d'Harnoncourt, *Futurism: and the International Avant-Garde* (Philadelphia: Philadelphia Museum of Art, 1980-1981), 13.

⁸³ Cinzia Blum, "Rhetorical Strategies and Gender in Marinetti's Futurist Manifesto," *Italica* 67, no. 2 (Summer 1990), 196. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/478592> (accessed September 22, 2008).

⁸⁴ Stewart, *Persuasion and Social Movements*, 225.

⁸⁵ Filippo Tommaso Marinetti, "The Founding and Manifesto of Futurism," in *Manifesto: a century of isms*, ed. Mary Ann Caws (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2001), 185.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, 186.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, 187.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*

⁹¹ *Ibid.*

⁹² Blum, "Rhetorical Strategies and Gender in Marinetti's Futurist Manifesto," 202.

⁹³ Marinetti, "The Founding and Manifesto of Futurism," 187.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, 188.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, 189.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*

¹⁰² *Ibid.*, 185.

¹⁰³ While there are many subsequent Futurist Manifestos, the manifesto being mentioned in this paper can stand in for all of the manifestos because they are all very similar in structure and form.

¹⁰⁴ Umbro Boccioni et al., "Manifesto of the Futurist Painters 1910," in *Futurist Manifestos*, ed. Umbro Apollonio, trans. Robert Brain (Boston: MFA Publications, 1973), 26.

¹⁰⁵ A complete anthology of the major manifestos of Futurism in an English translation can be found in: Apollonio, Umbro, ed. *Futurist Manifestos*. translated by Robert Brain, R.W. Flint, J.C. Higgitt, and Caroline Tisdal. Boston: MFA Publications, 2001.

¹⁰⁶ Originally, before the onset of World War I, Gropius was supposed to be appointed as the director of Weimar's School of Arts and Crafts; however, the school's main building was turned in to a reserve military hospital during the war.

¹⁰⁷ Hans M. Wingler, *The Bauhaus: Weimar, Dessau, Berlin, Chicago* (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1976), 3.

¹⁰⁸ Walter Gropius, "Recommendations for the Founding of an Educational Institution as an Artistic Counseling Service for Industry, the Trades, and the Crafts," in *The Bauhaus: Weimar, Dessau, Berlin, Chicago*, by Hans M. Wingler (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1976), 23.

¹⁰⁹ Magdalena Droste, *The Bauhaus, 1919-1933: Reform and Avant-Garde* (Köln: Taschen, 2006), 15.

¹¹⁰ Magdalena Droste and Bauhaus Archiv, *Bauhaus 1919-1933* (Köln: Taschen, 2006), 22.

¹¹¹ Wingler, *The Bauhaus: Weimar, Dessau, Berlin, Chicago*, 11.

¹¹² *Ibid.*, 7.

¹¹³ Droste, *The Bauhaus, 1919-1933: Reform and Avant-Garde*, 92.

¹¹⁴ The Bauhaus moved to Berlin, Germany; during its final years, but unfortunately “during the Third Reich (1933-1945) when People, Race, Homeland, and Classicism became the highest values ...the Bauhaus was disparaged as ‘culturally bolshevist,’ ‘internationalist,’ and ‘Jewish’.” (Droste, *The Bauhaus, 1919-1933: Reform and Avant-Garde*, 7)

¹¹⁵ Wingler, *The Bauhaus: Weimar, Dessau, Berlin, Chicago*, 11.

¹¹⁶ Prominent Bauhaus scholars such as Magdalena Droste and Hans Wingler label call this document the Bauhaus Manifesto in their writings.

¹¹⁷ Walter Gropius, “Program of the Staatliche Bauhaus in Weimar,” in *The Bauhaus: Weimar, Dessau, Berlin, Chicago*, by Hans M. Wingler (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1976), 31.

¹¹⁸ Gropius is inspired by the neo-Gothic artistic language as it is seen in the English Arts and Crafts movement.

¹¹⁹ *Ibid.*

¹²⁰ Although the Bauhaus employed an international faculty, only German students could enroll and Gropius’ ultimate aim was for the improvement of German art and design.

¹²¹ *Ibid.*

¹²² *Ibid.*

¹²³ *Ibid.*

¹²⁴ *Ibid.*

¹²⁵ The woodcut medium of Feininger’s print is important because it is a traditional medium unlike the modern chromo-lithography being used at this time.

¹²⁶ *Ibid.*

¹²⁷ Walter Gropius, *Scope of Total Architecture, World Perspectives* vol. 3, ed. Ruth Nanda Anshen (New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1955), 6.

¹²⁸ R. Aldington et al., “Beyond Action and Reaction,” in *Manifestos: a century of isms*, ed. Mary Ann Caws (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2001), 340.

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*

¹³⁰ *Ibid.*, 341.

¹³¹ Tristan Tzara, “Dada Manifesto,” in *Manifesto: a century of isms*, ed. Mary Ann Caws (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2001), 299.

¹³² *Ibid.*, 300.

¹³³ *Ibid.*, 302.

¹³⁴ Collaborators: Theo van Doesburg, Robt. Van’T Hoff, Vilmos Huszár, Antony Kok, Piet Mondrian, G. Vantongerloo, and Jan Wils.

¹³⁵ Theo van Doesburg et al., “Manifesto I of De Stijl,” in *Manifesto: a century of isms*, ed. Mary Ann Caws (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2001), 424.

¹³⁶ *Ibid.*

¹³⁷ *Ibid.*

¹³⁸ The followers who signed the bottom of this document are: Louis Aragon, Antonin Artaud, Jacques Baron, Joë Bousquet, J.-A. Boiffard, André Breton, Jean Carrive, Michel Leiris, Georges Limbour, Mathias Lübeck, Georges Malkine, André Masson, Max Morise, Pierre Naville, René Crevel, Robert Desnos, Paul Éluard, Max Ernst, T. Frankel, Francis Gérard, Marcel Noll, Benjamin Péret, Raymond Queneau, Philippe Soupault, Dédé Sunmean, and Roland Tual.

¹³⁹ Louis Aragon et al., “Declaration of January 27, 1925,” in *Manifesto: a century of isms*, ed. Mary Ann Caws (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2001), 450.

¹⁴⁰ Hans M. Wingler, *The Bauhaus: Weimar, Dessau, Berlin, Chicago*, 8.